

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (Site Inspections)

2 February 2015

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Councillor S Hudson, Councillor M James, Councillor O James, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens and Councillor D Rees.

(Site Inspection: 10.00 a.m. – 10.25 a.m.)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr D Ellis, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor L Jenkins, Mr AE Sangster, Mrs M Thomas, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

2. Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed Members to the meeting and reminded them that the purpose of the visit that day was purely to enable Members to acquaint themselves with the application site and the surrounding area. No decision would be made until the planning application was considered at a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.

3. NP/14/0637 – Diversification of Brumwells Garden Machinery with the provision of 12 sustainable wigwam lodges with car parking on adjacent land. Link the existing dwelling of Badgers Holt as a live-work dwelling for the two businesses – Brumwell Garden Machinery, Badgers Holt, Jameston

The Planning Officer reminded Members of the Committee that this application sought permission for the change of use of the garden area of Badgers Holt to a “glamping” holiday site comprising twelve wigwams and associated road access, car parking spaces, cycle store and foul water discharge, and the linking of the existing dwelling as a live/ work unit to the “glamping” site and existing garden machinery business.

It was considered that the principle of this proposal did not comply with adopted policies in relation to the provision of new camping, caravanning and static sites within the open countryside. Furthermore, the proposal would represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, which would be out of character with and detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. While the applicant's agent had stated that he considered that there were material considerations that overrode the adopted policies in this case, officers did not consider that these considerations were compelling to justify a departure to the development plan. As such the application was not considered to be acceptable and was recommended for refusal.



In order to assist Members, the applicant had marked out the approximate location of the wigwams on site, these were to be spread out around the site and their density was less towards the bottom of the site. The line of the roadway had also been mown in the grass. In response to questions from Members, the Officer pointed out the approximate location of car parking spaces, noting that there would be no parking outside of the cabins, only space for loading/off-loading. With regard to the loss of trees, the agent responded that eight trees would be lost and these were marked on the plan accompanying the application. The planning officer added that in the view of the Authority's tree officer, the loss of the trees would not be detrimental to the site as a whole. All existing boundaries/hedges would be retained. The officer also clarified that the structures were considered to be permanent due to the construction of the road layout and the foul drainage runs.

Members then walked around the site and asked whether it was considered to be a garden and whether it was in the open countryside. The planning officer replied that the site was not considered to be brownfield and it was not a typical garden due to its extensive nature and the fact that it was also used by the business. However it was considered to be in the open countryside as it was outside the development limit for Jameston. Members asked that information on the definition of curtilage as well as greenfield/brownfield sites in planning terms be included in the next report to the Committee on this site, and also to clarify with the agent whether the site had been an orchard. Members noted a pond in the bottom corner of the site and questioned whether any safety measures were proposed to surround it. Officers replied that nothing was shown on the plans, however this could be given consideration if the application were approved.

Thanking Members for their attendance, the Chairman noted that the application would be considered by the Committee at its next meeting on 4th March 2015.

